

Gary Cassill

I have lived here for 28 years. PSE sold and developed the land around the lake as a recreational property and they guaranteed water levels in the lake during the summer season. Many homeowners invested in fixed docks and boat lifts based on that promise. Dropping the lake level even one foot below the average level of 541 will render most of these highly taxed properties far less usable and significantly drop their values. Not only will this irritate the most significant property tax base of the area by fluctuating the levels during the summer you will undoubtedly cause some lawsuits which will be expensive to manage.

PSE has been successfully stalling and avoiding the inevitable licensing showdown for decades. They have been making a huge profit on the original investment. They have operated the machinery far longer than they originally designed it for. They made promises to the people that they sold the lakefront property to. Now they have to sleep in the bed that they built.

I am sure that PSE will be happy to sell the water rights to the Cascade Alliance but they made promises to the people that they sold lake-front and lake-access property to and that should be seriously considered before an agreement is finalized that creates a significant hardship on the very people who helped them develop it.

By the way if the Puyallup Indian Nation is so concerned about the salmon in the White River, why do they set up multiple gill nets that cross the entire river? You can barely get a boat around them when you can see the nets. How is a fish population supposed to avoid getting decimated by these netting practices? Yet they want everyone else to sacrifice to save the salmon?

There must be reasonable flow to maintain the functional and safe lake levels and the proper river levels for the fish then the excess can be sold if PSE and Cascade Water Alliance can agree to terms. New agreements should not jeopardize existing agreements and responsibilities. First you must honor your original guarantees then strike out on new ways to make a buck.

Daniel Grigsby P.E.

Water rights currently held by the City of Bonney Lake for wells adjacent to Lake Tapps could be adversely impacted if insufficient water is provided in Lake Tapps. These wells provide up to 50% of the water used in the Bonney Lake water service area that surrounds Lake Tapps and includes the City of Bonney Lake.

Recreational use of Lake Tapps needs to be considered when water right allocation is decided by setting a minimum water level during summer recreational periods. Failure to do so would have adverse impacts on City of Bonney Lake and Pierce County recreation programs that rely on this lake. Public safety public recreation as well as adverse property value impacts could result.

Public Safety is a concern because Tree stumps/snags will become a greater safety hazard to boaters and skiers if the low water level in the summer falls below current levels. Should a lower water level be set during summer recreational use consideration should be given to cutting these stumps/snags lower or removing them entirely.

Water quality is also a concern if a sufficient flow of water does not enter and leave the reservoir area. Stagnant water areas and prolonged wet mud flats would be a breeding ground for mosquitoes. Additional mosquito abatement would be necessary. This could also lead to an increase in noxious weeds that create foul odors and kill off fish and other aquatic vegetation.

Levies and privately owned waterfront walls/quays have been built over the years on Lake Tapps that could be adversely impacted by the change in water level of the lake. Wind and watercraft generated

waves impacting at different levels on these structures could result in more rapid deterioration of them would otherwise occur with current water levels.

The Washington State Shoreline Management Act should be considered since Lake Tapps is a water body of the State.

Chris Dersch

I am private home owner living on Lake Tapps. I am encouraged by the progress to date and the potential for a solution that would save the lake. The water rights to allow Lake Tapps to be used for drinking water are critical for the on-going viability of the lake. However I have concerns with the proposal as written. It is my understanding that the Dept. of Ecology's modeling for lake levels when drinking water is being withdrawn from the lake will result in the lake level being too low for recreational use late in the summer one out of every four years.

It's distressing that Lake Tapps was built with government approval and turned into a significant revenue-generating area for Pierce County local cities and business through the continued development of land around the lake and the lake itself for recreational purposes. While I understand changes are required to protect the fish and wildlife in the region I believe recreational lake levels through September are critical to maintain the significant investment of the homeowners on the lake. This can be accomplished one of two ways. Permit more flows into Lake Tapps or regulate fewer flows out of the lake for water consumption or both.

I believe with a slight modification to the current agreement that would result in recreational boating levels May through September you'll gain the whole-hearted support of all the lake residents.

TC Stone

As a Lake Tapps homeowner I am very concerned that the current proposal for saving the lake has the recreational level of the lake dropping below safe boating levels before Labor Day in one in four years.

Given the uncertainty of global warming changing weather patterns unpredictable rainfall amounts etc...I encourage you to adjust the plan to ensure that the lake water extraction does not allow in any foreseeable year to bring the level below safe boating standards before Labor Day.

Diana Aresu

You can use this area to provide your comments/suggestions on the Draft Lake Tapps Report of Examination.

There has not been adequate communication to affected homeowners regarding the potential adverse implications of the proposal. Of grave concern are safety of lake levels for recreational use and affect on property values.

Please relay recommendation to Homeowners Associations to communicate more relevant information than simply repeating content reported in local newspapers.

The impact to affected homeowners as key stakeholders should not be dealt with lightly. I would recommend a formal mailing to all property owners highlighting the facts.

David Plummer

The CWA proposed development of a regional municipal water supply/delivery system has never been subjected to public review and comment. CWA has been formed as a quasi-public agency on the sole authority of the various municipal governments comprising its membership; it makes no effort to solicit or

obtain meaningful input from the public. None of the municipal government bodies have solicited or obtained any input on the formation or operation of CWA from the citizens of their communities.

CWA's projections of potable water demand are entirely based on extrapolations of past demand into the distant future and are based on the assumption that population growth will continue to reinforce the commitments to growth of their member municipalities. These population growth projections are subject to considerable uncertainty and have never been subjected to public scrutiny or approval; they are merely gerrymandered allocations of the State Office of Financial Management growth projections. The Puget Sound Regional Council is currently evaluating several Regional growth scenarios one of which considers the wider geographic distribution of population in the Puget Sound Region; if this scenario were adopted as the preferred growth vector for the Region it would seriously affect CWA's demand projections.

CWA's capital cost and retail water-rate cost estimates are not based on life cycle cost analyses as recommended by 39.35RCW and do not reflect unbiased estimates of the acquisition ownership and retirement costs for the water supply system proposed by CWA. Further CWA has made no estimate of the 'levelized' water costs (i.e. The unit cost that must be charged for each unit of water consumed over the useful life of the system to recover all acquisition ownership and retirement costs for the proposed water supply system); consequently the amount of public subsidy required for the system is not known.

CWA does not have a qualified staff to perform the required technical engineering and cost estimating analyses for the proposed WSP.

David Plummer

Hi there! - Could you send me a copy of the comment I just sent in - I failed to make a copy.

Mark Martino

Kirkland our home town and other eastside communities are in the process of selecting water sources one of which is Lake Tapps. Since Lake Tapps is a recreational lake it is likely that boat traffic contributes to polluting the lake. In addition Lake Tapps is surrounded by about 2 000 homes many on septic systems. This seems to me to be an inferior source of water compared to our current relatively pristine water source. While purification methods may render the end product technically potable they are not likely to make the water drinkable. It is for these reasons that I am against committing to using Lake Tapps as a water source for Kirkland.

Heidi North

I am a fourth generation resident on Lake Tapps. My great-grandfather built the second house on the lake and told us stories about how he and his colleagues logged and dredged four lakes to create the reservoir we all know as Tapps.

I would like there to see a compromise reached so that the water level will remain at recreational capacity from Memorial Day to Labor Day at the minimum. More than 2 000 lakefront households on the lake pay some of the highest taxes in Pierce County for the privilege of waterfront living. Thousands more visit each summer to enjoy the fishing skiing boating bird watching and stunning views of Mt. Rainier. We would like to be able to continue to enjoy the use of the lake during the summer months.

We are excited about the plans Cascade Water Alliance has for piping drinking water to Eastside communities. We lived in Redmond and Bellevue for many years so we feel loyalty to that area just as much as to our Pierce County neighbors. We ask that the needs of both areas continue to be served equally and respectfully.

Tim Lenander

Please continue to keep Lake Tapps at safe boating levels from at least Memorial Day to Labor Day every year.

Janice Jurcan

Regarding the Draft Lake Tapps Report of Examination--I am concerned about the potential that the lake may not be at safe boating levels one out of four years. This is not what I regard as "saving the lake". This lake provides a huge financial benefit to this area but most important it provides a place for family & friends to interact. It just can't be out of use for a year. I hope that a better agreement can be reached to guarantee this.

Richard Willard

I am completely opposed to this project.

Renay Bennett

You can use this area to provide your comments/suggestions on the Draft Lake Tapps Report of Examination.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important proposal.

First off there are very few people who even know that this is happening. I am alarmed at the secrecy that has kept this decision in the dark.

I am very concerned about the safety of this water supply as it is heavily influenced by humans. The long term effects of pharmaceuticals in human influenced water are not known.

I understand that in 2003 the legislature has passed a law that forbids the Department of Ecology from barring water rights based on safety. This is an evil plot and the legislature knows it. I am shocked and ashamed that they would pass this law. It quite frankly shows how little they care for us.

The protection of our environment is also critical to this project - and I am not convinced that PSE will do its part to protect the environment. They never have.

PLEASE do not grant any water rights from Lake Tapps for drinking.

Tom Morton

As a shoreline land owner on Lake Tapps I'd like to encourage the preservation of summer water levels at full between Memorial Day and Labor Day. August is a very heavily used month for recreation on Lake Tapps and the disruption of an unplanned drop in water level would indeed be significant. We owners have lived with the uncertainty of Tapps for over 7 years now and with the solution so close at hand it would be a shame to let the water level issue blossom into a full scale problem for shoreline owners. The months of July and August are the only two critical months for full water levels. Don't let August slip away.

Barb Kenney

Bellevue residents deserve clean water to drink. If Seattle residents/government rejects this water for them then why should we be forced to drink this water? What is the problem with the cities that want this separate water supply? The DOE should rule on the cleanliness of this water. The 2003 law that was passed to not include this in the discussion shows the fraud that is happening.

Donna Dansenburg

My family has enjoyed Lake Tapps for more than 50 years and I am writing to ask that at a minimum the lake continue to be maintained at safe boating levels from Memorial Day to Labor Day.

Sarah Reed

I think it is a very big mistake to use Lake Tapps for a water supply! Seattle said no and so does Kirkland and my family. Please say no!

Fredda Goldfarb

I am a registered voter and I strongly oppose the use of Lake Tapps as a source of drinking water for the eastside. The Cedar and Tolt rivers should be used as sources. This PWS project will be detrimental to public welfare and should be rejected.

Anne Brunell

I understand that Lake Tapps has many homes around it on septic tanks. The quality of the water there is in question. I think water quality should be considered above nearly every other factor. I certainly don't like the idea that my family and I would be unknowingly poisoning ourselves with who knows what contaminates. Failure to protect the quality of our water is a failure to protect the health and safety of our community - and isn't that why we have government?

It seems crazy to me as it is pouring rain outside after record rains that getting clean water to drink in this region would even be an issue.

Please ensure that our future water quality is at least as clean and safe as it has been historically.

Bob Glover

Why on earth would anyone want to drink water from a lake surrounded by huge number of septic tanks and lawn chemicals just to help out Puget Sound Energy.

Do not consider this unless the water can pass the strictest tests of quality which every other water district must meet.

No exceptions even though the Legislators seem to think lake and river water is more pure.

Do not send this water to my house. If Seattle won't allow it why would anyone else!

It is short sighted decisions like this that come back to haunt everyone and cause lawsuits later on when people start having the delayed medical problems from drinking the water.

Peter Doman

We have to provide a reasonable approach to keeping the lake at an acceptable levels for recreation during the summer months. 0 to 18 inches range certainly would work...anything more than that would driven huge issues with the people that use and enjoy the lake during the summer season.

Blyth Claeys

Please reconsider the use of Lake Tapps for our drinking water! There is no need to change the current system of clean safe water with water polluted by septic tanks and other pollutants in the area that are washed into the lake.

Bill Henningsaard

I am opposed to the use of water from Lake Tapps to supply drinking water to homes in Medina and elsewhere on the Eastside. The lake water is subject to heavy recreational use and domestic run-off including fertilizers and septic systems. The existing clean water supplies from the Tolt and Cedar rivers are still available and affordable and should be retained.

Robert Rudolph

I am very much opposed to the use of Lake Tapps drinking water. The Puget Sound basin now has some of the purest drinking water in the nation from the protected areas of the Tolt and Cedar River basins. Lake Tapps is surrounded by homes and the lake is used recreationally--boating and swimming etc. Although water can be purified some contaminants from these uses will not be removable. To use Lake Tapps for this purpose will be to degrade the Puget Sound water supply quality--something that should be protected.

Please do not permit this use.

James McMillan MD

Dear Sirs: We are adamantly opposed to using water from Lake Tapps to supply drinking water for our community! This lake is surrounded by homes with septic tanks and is used for all manner of recreation etc. No amount of water treatment short of distillation could be counted upon to render this water something I want my family or neighbors drinking. We sit in proximity to one of the world's largest aquifers I understand and have abundant rainfall and nearby mountains to arrange sources of clean and dependable drinking water. This is a ridiculous (and overly costly!) plan and needs to be abandoned immediately without wasting any more of our tax dollars exploring it.

Larry Chase

We are greatly concerned that the water levels won't be safe for boating if the levels don't remain up from Memorial Day to Labor Day (minimum). Even during high water we have known people to ruin props. When we water-ski in some areas and you fall you actually can stand up on the bottom. It would be very dangerous to have the water level down during the high June-Sept days as there are many unsafe stumps in the lake.

Joann Elmore

I have heard about the possibility of taking water from Lake Tapps for our Bellevue/ Medina city drinking water. I have great concerns about the quality of this water. As a clinician who has seen the effect of toxins and contaminated drinking supplies in third world countries I would not want to see us in a similar situation.

Geoffrey Bidwell

It appears after reading the report for the above project that the DOE has failed to address many issues relating to said proposal.

DOE has failed to discuss the quality of the water as it relates to development and human contact particularly from the discharge of septic systems known to contain PPCP and other excreted products from the over 2 500 homes that surround the lake. Adequate filtration of these products is not possible with such a large volume water system. The long term combined effects to humans from drinking such water day after day are unknown. The EPA is still in its preliminary stages of researching the quantity and the effects of PPCP in the environment and in drinking water. Developing allowable safe standards for many of these PPCP will be in the distant future.

The City of Seattle is so concerned with this issue that it has refused CWA to use its water transmission lines. Further the City of Mercer Island exited the agreement with the CWA in part due to water quality issues (the other was cost predictability and risk).

Although the DOE may not have the authority to refuse water rights based on water quality the report should at least state so and describe the development and human contact around the lake and of EPA position and authority as it relates to PPCP.

The cities who are participating in the CWA have failed to inform its citizens of the Lake Tapps project. Very few citizens are aware of this project even though RCW 36.70A.035 specifically requires information to be posted to foster public participation.

The total water demand from TABLE 5 of your report is inaccurate and misleading. For example Bellevue's demand is contrary to the 2000 census report that concludes ... the growth of the number of Bellevue residents is likely to slow substantially in the future... . Further Bellevue's predicted future shortage is a creation of the CWA by failing to sign a long term water agreement with Seattle. Mercer Island signed a long term 60 year contract with Seattle. This water issue is clearly a power grab to gain influence in the region as Bellevue tried 20 years ago by attempting to build its own dam project on the Tolt River. Fortunately then the Federal government stepped in and said NO.

The DOE should explain its authority on water quality and revise the report to reflect this together with a review of EPA role particularly with respect to PPCP.

This proposed PWS will be detrimental to the public welfare and interest and as such this Surface Water Application number S2-29934 should be denied.

John Wilbanks

I can't believe you're going to replace our pristine drinking water coming from Tolt and Cedar River watersheds with water polluted by the run off from all the homes ringing the shores of Lake Tapps. In addition the number of personal watercraft and boats that use Lake Tapps add an incredible amount of pollutants in the form of oil and gasoline to the water. What are you thinking?!?

Yes I understand that water from Tolt and Cedar requires filtration but starting with cleaner non-polluted water and filtering it is far different than trying to filter out all the manmade pollutants that are in Lake Tapps.

I don't want to drink that water...I want to drink water from non-polluted reserves.

Debbie Nation

As your e-mail states - YES we'd like CLEAN WATER. I've seen Lake Tapps (when they used to empty it); I know how incredibly dirty it is and when you think of all the septic systems that are so close to the

lake you can't imagine why this would even become a suggestion/proposal to use this water as our DRINKING water!!!

I live in Kirkland and sell real estate all throughout King County I do NOT want this water for myself my family my friends or my clients! I would feel this would need to be disclosed to potential home buyers on a Form 17 (Seller Disclosure Form through the Northwest Multiple Listing Association) are you going to handle those questions from concerned home buyers? I doubt it.

Please do something other than use this water for our drinking water. It's appalling!

Thank you for listening and hopefully ACTING

Drew Mooney

Regarding the Draft Lake Tapps Report of Examination.

Are you seriously planning to expose us to pollutants in lawn chemicals (which wash into the lake) and in human consumed pharmaceuticals (which also go into the lake via the septic tank drainfields)??

I'm sure there are tradeoffs you must consider but are you sure this makes sense?? Will you be able to sleep at night??

Can we trust you to safeguard our health??

Kathryn Hardesty

You can use this area to provide your comments/suggestions on the Draft Lake Tapps Report of Examination.

It's no brainier. Clean water period!!!

Diane Stein

I am STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THE USE OF LAKE TAPPS WATER FOR OUR WATER SUPPLY. WHY WOULD WE USE WATER FROM AN AREA THAT IS NOT CLEAN ENOUGH TO DRINK AND POSES A HEALTH THREAT TO OUR FAMILIES? PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS COSTLY AND POOR PLAN.

Robin Blackburn

Oppose using Lake Tapps water for our drinking water source. It will not improve our water quality but will make it inferior. Please reconsider this plan.

Susan Hansen

Not sure my first one went through... We are opposed to the current proposal to get drinking water supplied from the Lake Tapps area. Because of the septic tank situation: possible run-off from the Lake's housing areas.

This could mean undesirable substances leaching into the water and exposing people to toxic burdens over time by drinking the water etc. We are health conscious folk who really care about what we put into our bodies! No thank you to this proposal!!!

Tom Hoffman

The Board of Commissioners for King County Water District 90 appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Lake Tapps Water Supply Project Report of examination(ROE).The Board has noted that the District's entire Service Area is included in the legal description of the Place of Use(POU). This raises concerns regarding existing water rights and potential involvement/conflict with Cascade Water Alliance.

The Board invested substantial time and effort exploring membership in the Cascade Water Alliance (CWA) when that organization was initially formed. At that time the Board concluded that joining CWA was not in the best interest of the District's ratepayers. As the elected representatives of the District's ratepayers the Board feels strongly that it should have meaningful involvement in any process that would implicate the Board's prior decision in the future. The ROE is at best vague with regard to the Project's and the designated POU's impact on existing water rights and the opportunity and ability of the District to participate in any process concerning voluntary or involuntary use of the Lake Tapps water as a viable alternate water source. The extent to which approval of the pending Application as described in the ROE impacts these concerns should be clarified and explicitly stated in the ROE and further opportunity for comment provided prior to approval of the Application.

Leslie Ryan-Connelly

Wish there would have been a fact sheet or some summary of the draft report. I did not have the time to read through the 100 pages document. However I would like you to be aware of the work I conducted for my thesis at The Evergreen State College. My work reviewed the temperature and flow data available for one year period (2002) to assess the needed flow to meet state water quality standards in the White River. My analysis found that a minimum instream flow of 1180 cfs was needed to meet temperature standards in the summer and this would still have resulted in approximately 20 days of exceedences.

From my quick review of the draft report it doesn't look like the instream flow in the White River will come close to 1200 cfs in the summer months which are a critical life stage for juvenile salmon. My thesis did recommend conducting a more thorough temperature modeling effort. I hope this has been part of your report.

You can find my thesis work in The Evergreen State College library. I hope you will reconsider the flow rates that have been established in the draft report. My work has demonstrated that much more water volume is needed to meet state temperature standards in the lower White River

Craig Halverson

After reviewing the information I feel that is a poorly conceived idea. The area in question that would supply water is in an area that is surrounded by septic systems that would feed into our water supply. Enough said.

David Schmidt

The City of Buckley strongly believes that the Dept. of Ecology has a responsibility to evaluate and accommodate the future water needs of growing communities within the White River Basin before authorizing transfers of White River water to communities outside of the basin to meet their projected 50-year demands.

Buckley was established in the basin 100 years ago. We have worked diligently to find and develop water supplies. We have spent time and money that for us frankly is in short supply. Unfortunately we face an uncertain future because it is difficult to develop water supplies in the basin sufficient to meet even 20-year demands. The City of Buckley needs water rights as well as the practical means of diverting and storing water and mitigating for water use.

We have complied with the Legislature direction to plan for growth including planning for future water supplies. In passing the Growth Management Act the Legislature recognized that planning is essentially a local function. Unfortunately the local community cannot meet our growth management obligations alone.

The State of Washington has mandated growth management. Now we need the help of our planning partner the State of Washington to get the job done.

The citizens of the state have granted the Dept. of Ecology the public trust responsibility and obligation to manage water resources in a way that meets the water needs of all of the state citizens and the environment. It is a challenging task but it is an important responsibility. If Ecology does not consider the needs of the White River watershed now the ability of our community to survive and thrive for another hundred years will be in serious doubt.

The Lake Tapps water right decision will affect local communities for generations. The ROE as currently drafted proposes a win-lose situation for local communities: PSE and CWA get what they want and the watershed communities get nothing. In the absence of Ecology leadership communities and stakeholders in the watershed are already being forced to fight one another over a resource we don't control.

Where the future of the watershed is at stake consideration of this water right cannot be just about who got their application in line first or who has the most money. The State must step up to the mark and support local communities in fulfilling our duty to meet future demands.

Ecology can achieve a win-win situation if it considers the needs of the basin and looks for creative solutions. The Governor and the Director of the Dept. of Ecology have taken proactive steps towards collaborative problem solving on water resource issues in other parts of the state for example in the Columbia River Basin. We urge the Department of Ecology to take the lead in developing a regional solution for water-resource issues in the White River Basin that involves all of the affected communities within the local watershed.

For the purposes of the informal review period the City has some additional comments:

1. It has apparently not been decided where the diversion structure and related controls will be located and how the physical facilities will be built and operated. Since this diversion will potentially have substantial impacts on property interests and the environment in the area local citizens and their elected representatives should be consulted and have an opportunity to comment on the proposed location and elevation design and operation of these facilities before a decision is made on this water right.
2. On page 27 the ROE states. Additional analysis would be conducted to determine which streams and water purveyors would participate in the source exchange program. If this program goes forward criteria for selection and approval should be identified up front and the selection process should include communities in the watershed.
3. Will Ecology be responsible for enforcing lake levels in Lake Tapps?
4. On page 31 higher flushing flows are assumed to be necessary for Lake Tapps water quality. The ROE should explain in more detail the justification for the higher flushing flows and the regulatory basis for water quality targets for Lake Tapps.
5. It would be helpful for the ROE to provide in tabular format or other easy-to- compare format the difference in the river between 10(j) flows and modified 10(j) flows at the diversion and at other locations on the river. Please include a summary table showing existing conditions 10(j) flows and modified 10(j) flows and the problems and benefits of each. Information provided might include differences in water elevations differences in rates of flow differences in total daily flow and differences in monthly flow for a range of conditions (high flow months low flow months average day etc.).
6. While some of the figures and tables are explained in text clearer labeling of the tables or figures might be helpful. For example the location of Figure 8 could be provided on the figure itself.

To summarize Ecology must insure that residents in the watershed have access to adequate safe water supply at least 50 years into the future. A decision about water allocation in the White River Basin should be based on a thorough evaluation of future water needs in the watershed. Such a decision-making process will fulfill the agency public trust responsibilities and will truly be in the overriding consideration of the public interest.

We urge Ecology to take the long view and initiate a proactive dialogue to address the water needs of the watershed - before issuing a decision. Only after future water needs and supplies been assessed and secured within the Basin should water be allocated to meet needs outside the Basin.

We look forward to working with Ecology and the proponents on a regional approach to water supply planning and development in the White River Basin.

These comments are offered as a contribution to the discussion during the informal comment period. By making these comments the City does not intend to waive any rights it may have and reserves the right to take action as necessary including legal action to protect its interests.

Susan Moss

I am opposed to the proposed use of Lake Tapps as a source of drinking water as this is a recreational lake surrounded by over 2000 homes. As many are on septic systems I am concerned that filtration will not adequately remove excreted drugs and chemicals from this drinking water source. Long term effects from ingestion of this type of water are currently unknown.

I understand that existing clean water supplies from the Cedar and Tolt Rivers are still available and affordable. I also understand that the City of Seattle has already rejected Lake Tapps as a drinking water source.

I urge you to find an alternative - the Lake Tapps source is not acceptable and should be rejected.

Anderson, Chris (ECY)

From: Susan Sullivan [susan@ramblingclan.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 25, 2006 8:35 PM
To: Anderson, Chris (ECY); Loranger, Thomas J.
Subject: Lake Tapps - Opposed to Lake Tapps as Bellevue Water Source

Tom & Chris,

I tried to send my comments via the Lake Tapps website, but there is an error in the last name field that won't allow me to post my comments. So, I am sending my comments to you.

Thanks.
Susan Sullivan

Dear Department of Ecology:

I am writing to inform you that I am emphatically opposed to changing the Bellevue water supply to Lake Tapps. I do not want to be drinking water from a source that is surrounded by homes on septic systems and that is subject to direct run-off from pesticide and fertilizer.

Sincerely,
Susan Sullivan

11/27/2006